

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 26, 2006. Claims 1 to 48 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 9, 12, 22, 30, 33 and 43 to 48 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The specification and the drawings were objected to. As for the specification, no amendments have been made thereto. Rather, the drawings have been amended to conform with the specification. In this regard, submitted herewith are Replacement Sheets for Figs. 2 and 3. In Fig. 2, reference number 102 has been amended to "201" in accordance with the description provided in the specification. In Fig. 3, step S302 referring to "Mail Delivery" has been amended to --S304-- in accordance with the description provided in the specification. Approval of the replacement sheets and withdrawal of the objections to the specification and drawings are respectfully requested.

Claims 46 to 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Without conceding the correctness of the rejections, the preamble of the claims have been amended to recite that the program is stored on a computer medium. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 101 rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Europe 1 003 307 (Motoyama) in view of Europe 0 150 273 (Kelly). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns sending messages on a network. According to one of the various aspects of the invention, information concerning the apparatus (e.g., state information) is obtained, and a language to be used in a message to be sent is determined from among a plurality of languages. The message to be sent is then created, in

the determined language, based on the obtained information, and the message is sent onto the network. In a related aspect, the message is created in one of a plurality of languages specified for each destination to which the message is to be sent, while in another related aspect, the message is created in one of a plurality of languages specified for each content type of the message. As a result of the foregoing,

Referring specifically to the Claims amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a communication controller for controlling communication between an apparatus and a network, comprising an obtaining unit adapted for obtaining information concerning the apparatus, a language determining unit adapted for determining a language to be used in a message to be sent, from among a plurality of languages, a message creating unit adapted for creating a message to be sent, based on the information obtained by the obtaining unit, in the language determined by the language determining unit, and a sending unit adapted for sending the message created by the message creating unit onto the network.

Amended independent Claims 22, 43 and 46 are apparatus, method and program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

Amended independent Claim 9 is directed to a communication controller for controlling communication between an apparatus and a network, comprising an obtaining unit adapted for obtaining information concerning the apparatus, a message creating unit adapted for creating a message to be sent, based on the information obtained by the obtaining unit, in one of a plurality of languages specified for each destination to which the message is to be sent, and a sending unit adapted for sending the message created by the message creating unit onto the network.

Amended independent Claims 30, 44 and 47 are apparatus, method and

program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 9.

Amended independent Claim 12 is directed to a communication controller for controlling communication between an apparatus and a network, comprising an obtaining unit adapted for obtaining information concerning the apparatus, a message creating unit adapted for creating a message to be sent, based on the information obtained by the obtaining unit, in one of a plurality of languages specified for each content type of the message, and a sending unit adapted for sending the message created by the message creating unit on the network.

Amended independent Claims 33, 45 and 48 are apparatus, method and program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 12.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention. More particularly, with regard to Claims 1, 22, 43 and 46, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of determining a language to be used in a message to be sent, from among a plurality of languages, and creating a message to be sent, based on obtained information of the apparatus, in the determined language. Similarly, with regard to Claims 9, 30, 44 and 47, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of creating a message to be sent, based on obtained concerning the apparatus, in one of a plurality of languages specified for each destination to which the message is to be sent. Likewise, with regard to Claims 12, 33, 45 and 48, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of creating a message to be sent, based on obtained information concerning the apparatus, in one of a plurality of languages specified for each content type of the message.

Motoyama is merely seen to disclose that a computer obtains information on

a device and creates an electronic mail message including the device information.

However, Motoyama does not disclose or suggest that the message is created based on one of plurality of languages that are determined based on the obtained device information.

Thus, Motoyama is not seen to teach the features of the invention.

Kelly is merely seen to disclose a system including a sending node 1 where language AAA is used, and a receiving node 3 where language BBB is used. For a message to a user who uses the language AAA, the sending node 1 composes the message and sends it to the user. On the other hand, for a message to a user who uses the language BBB, the sending node 1 does not compose the message, but sends message identification to the user. Obviously, Kelly creates (composes) a message in a single one language (AAA). For the language BBB, Kelly does not compose any message. Accordingly, Kelly is not seen to add anything that, when combined with Motoyama, would have resulted in the above features of the invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of Claims 1 to 48 are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 112952v1